

**MISSOURI STATE AUDITOR'S OFFICE
FISCAL NOTE (18-334)**

Subject

Initiative petition from Steven Reed regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to Article IV. (Received January 10, 2018)

Date

January 30, 2018

Description

This proposal would amend Article IV of the Missouri Constitution.

The amendment is to be voted on in November 2018.

Public comments and other input

The State Auditor's office requested input from the **Attorney General's office**, the **Department of Agriculture**, the **Department of Economic Development**, the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education**, the **Department of Higher Education**, the **Department of Health and Senior Services**, the **Department of Insurance**, **Financial Institutions and Professional Registration**, the **Department of Mental Health**, the **Department of Natural Resources**, the **Department of Corrections**, the **Department of Labor and Industrial Relations**, the **Department of Revenue**, the **Department of Public Safety**, the **Department of Social Services**, the **Governor's office**, the **Missouri House of Representatives**, the **Department of Conservation**, the **Department of Transportation**, the **Office of Administration**, the **Office of State Courts Administrator**, the **Missouri Senate**, the **Secretary of State's office**, the **Office of the State Public Defender**, the **State Treasurer's office**, **Adair County**, **Boone County**, **Callaway County**, **Cass County**, **Clay County**, **Cole County**, **Greene County**, **Jackson County**, **Jasper County**, **St. Charles County**, **St. Louis County**, **Taney County**, the **City of Cape Girardeau**, the **City of Columbia**, the **City of Jefferson**, the **City of Joplin**, the **City of Kansas City**, the **City of Kirksville**, the **City of Mexico**, the **City of Raymore**, the **City of St. Joseph**, the **City of St. Louis**, the **City of Springfield**, the **City of Union**, the **City of Wentzville**, the **City of West Plains**, **Cape Girardeau 63 School District**, **Hannibal 60 School District**, **State Technical College of Missouri**, **Metropolitan Community College**, **University of Missouri**, **St. Louis Community College**, **Kansas City Board of Police Commissioners**, and the **Metropolitan Police Department - City of St. Louis**.

Assumptions

Officials from the **Attorney General's office** indicated they expect that, to the extent that the enactment of this proposal would result in increased litigation, their office can absorb the costs associated with that increased litigation using existing resources. However, if the enactment of this proposal were to result in substantial additional litigation, they may request additional appropriations.

Officials from the **Department of Agriculture** indicated no fiscal impact on their department.

Officials from the **Department of Economic Development** indicated no impact to their department.

Officials from the **Department of Higher Education** indicated this initiative petition would not have a fiscal impact on their department.

Officials from the **Department of Health and Senior Services** indicated no fiscal impact on their department.

Officials from the **Department of Insurance, Financial Institutions and Professional Registration** indicated this petition, if passed, will have no cost or savings to their department.

Officials from the **Department of Mental Health** indicated this proposal creates no direct obligations or requirements to their department that would result in a fiscal impact.

Officials from the **Department of Natural Resources** indicated they would not anticipate a direct fiscal impact from this proposal.

Officials from the **Department of Corrections** indicated currently, they have guidelines for staff when they are operating a state vehicle and using a cell phone. If this legislation passes, their department would either have to install hands free kits in all state vehicles or prohibit staff from using a cell phone while driving. Should they determine installing hands free kits in all state vehicles to be the best route, they believe the costs to be absorbable within their current budget constraints.

Officials from the **Department of Labor and Industrial Relations** indicated no fiscal impact on their department.

Officials from the **Department of Revenue** indicated this legislation will not have a fiscal impact on their department.

Officials from the **Department of Public Safety - Office of the Director** indicated they see no fiscal impact due to this legislation.

Officials from the **Department of Social Services** indicated no fiscal impact on their department.

Officials from the **Governor's office** indicated there should be no added costs or savings to their office.

Officials from the **Missouri House of Representatives** indicated no fiscal impact to their office.

Officials from the **Department of Conservation** indicated that no adverse fiscal impact to their department would be expected as a result of this initiative petition.

Officials from the **Department of Transportation** indicated no fiscal impact.

Officials from the **Office of Administration** indicated this proposal adds a Section 48(a) to Article IV Section 48 of the Missouri Constitution. It would prohibit the use of electronic devices while operating a moving vehicle, prohibit the use of a hand-held mobile telephone in a commercial motor vehicle and prohibit texting while operating a commercial motor vehicle. This should not impact their office.

Officials from the **Office of State Courts Administrator** indicated there may be some impact but there is no way to quantify that currently. Any significant changes will be reflected in future budget requests.

Officials from the **Missouri Senate** indicated they anticipate no fiscal impact.

Officials from the **Secretary of State's office** indicated each year, a number of joint resolutions that would refer to a vote of the people a constitutional amendment and bills that would refer to a vote of the people the statutory issue in the legislation may be considered by the General Assembly.

Unless a special election is called for the purpose, Referendums are submitted to the people at the next general election. Article III section 52(b) of the Missouri Constitution authorizes the general assembly to order a special election for measures referred to the people. If a special election is called to submit a Referendum to a vote of the people, Section 115.063.2 RSMo. requires the state to pay the costs. The cost of the special election has been estimated to be \$7.8 million based on the cost of the 2016 Presidential Preference Primary.

Their office is required to pay for publishing in local newspapers the full text of each statewide ballot measure as directed by Article XII, Section 2(b) of the Missouri Constitution and Section 116.230-116.290, RSMo. Their office is provided with core funding to handle a certain amount of normal activity resulting from each year's legislative session. Funding for this item is adjusted each year depending upon the election cycle with \$1.3 million historically appropriated in odd numbered fiscal years and \$100,000 appropriated in even numbered fiscal years to meet these requirements.

Through FY (fiscal year) 2013, the appropriation had historically been an estimated appropriation because the final cost is dependent upon the number of ballot measures approved by the General Assembly and the initiative petitions certified for the ballot. In FY 2015, the General Assembly changed the appropriation so that it was no longer an estimated appropriation. In FY 2017 their office was appropriated \$2.6 million to publish the full text of the measures. In FY 2017, at the August and November elections, there were 6 statewide Constitutional Amendments or ballot propositions that cost \$2.4 million to publish (an average of \$400,000 per issue). Their office will continue to assume, for the purposes of this fiscal note, that it should have the full appropriation authority it needs to meet the publishing requirements. Because these requirements are mandatory, they reserve the right to request funding to meet the cost of their publishing requirements if the Governor and the General Assembly again change the amount or continue to not designate it as an estimated appropriation.

Officials from the **Office of the State Public Defender** indicated the impact of this initiative petition on their office is not clear, as the punishment for operating a motor vehicle while using a hand held electronic device is not enumerated. If the offense is an infraction, there would be no impact. If the offense is a misdemeanor, punishable, with jail time - the impact would be large.

Officials from the **State Treasurer's office** indicated this proposal would have no fiscal impact upon their office.

Officials from **Greene County** indicated there are no estimated costs or savings to report from their county for this initiative petition.

Officials from **St. Louis County** indicated they report no fiscal impact for this initiative petition. Their county already has a policy in place banning the use of portable electronic devices while operating a county-owned vehicle.

Officials from the **City of Kansas City** indicated this amendment will have no fiscal impact on their city.

Officials from the **University of Missouri** indicated they do not believe that this initiative will have a significant fiscal impact on their university.

The State Auditor's office did not receive a response from the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, Adair County, Boone County, Callaway County, Cass County, Clay County, Cole County, Jackson County, Jasper County, St. Charles County, Taney County, the City of Cape Girardeau, the City of Columbia, the City of Jefferson, the City of Joplin, the City of Kirksville, the City of Mexico, the City of Raymore, the City of St. Joseph, the City of St. Louis, the City of Springfield, the City of Union, the City of Wentzville, the City of West Plains, Cape Girardeau 63 School District, Hannibal 60 School District, State Technical College of Missouri, Metropolitan Community College, St. Louis Community College, the**

Kansas City Board of Police Commissioners, and the Metropolitan Police Department - City of St. Louis.

Fiscal Note Summary

State governmental entities could incur additional costs, but the amount is unknown.
Local governmental entities estimate no costs or savings.